United Nations A/65/305/Add.2

General Assembly

Distr.: General
2 September 2010

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Agenda item 136
Human resources management

Human resources management reform: comprehensive assessment of the system of geographical distribution and assessment of the issues relating to possible changes in the number of posts subject to the system of geographical distribution

Report of the Secretary-General

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 63/250, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit proposals for a comprehensive review of the system of desirable ranges, with a view to establishing a more effective tool to ensure geographical distribution in relation to the total number of staff of the global United Nations Secretariat.

2. It reviews the origin and the purpose of the system of desirable ranges and the changes that have taken place since 1945 and updates the scenarios presented in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Comprehensive assessment of the system of geographical distribution and assessment of the issues relating to possible changes in the number of posts subject to the system of geographical distribution" (A/59/724). These updated scenarios provide information on how Member State representation could potentially change as a result of various changes to the system of desirable ranges.

II. Origins and initial purpose of the concept of geographical distribution of the staff

3. The representation of their nationals in the staff of the United Nations Secretariat has been a major concern of Member States since the beginning of the Organization. This concern is reflected in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, which governs the selection of staff:

10-48791 (E) 131010

Please recycle

> "The paramount consideration in the employment of staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible."

4. The first resolution of the General Assembly on the issue of the principle of geographical distribution (resolution 153 (II) of 15 November 1947) reaffirmed the principle of recruiting staff on as wide a geographic basis as possible. The third preambular paragraph of that resolution referred to the international character of the Organization and stated that in order to avoid undue predominance of national practices, the policies and administrative methods of the Secretariat should reflect, and profit to the highest degree from, assets of the various cultures and the technical competence of all Member nations.

5. In paragraph 2 of the same resolution the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to: (a) examine the recruitment policy with a view to improving the geographical distribution of posts within the various departments; (b) take the necessary steps with a view to engaging staff members from those countries that did not yet have any of their nationals in the Secretariat; and (c) take all practicable steps to ensure the improvement of the geographical distribution of the staff, including the issuance of such rules and regulations as might be necessary to comply with the principles of the Charter.

6. Pursuant to the same resolution, the Secretary-General submitted a report entitled "Composition of the Secretariat and the principle of geographical distribution" (A/652), in which the principles that determined his policy in this respect were set out.[1]

7. The concept expressed in the second sentence of Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter — "due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible" — is the basis of the principle of equitable geographical distribution. Defining what constituted equitable geographical distribution of the Secretariat and establishing a yardstick for measuring progress towards that end were first addressed in 1948 through the introduction of the concept of "desirable ranges" for Member States, in response to General Assembly resolution 153 (II).

8. Under this system, specific posts would not be distributed to Member States, but rather a range of posts was established within which each Member State would be adequately represented as a guideline for recruitment priorities. General Assembly resolution 1559 (XV) of 18 December 1960 confirmed the system of desirable ranges and linked the concept of geographical appointment status of staff with the concept of budgetary posts set aside for this purpose.

9. Until 1962, only one factor was used to determine the desirable ranges: the contribution of each Member State to the regular budget of the Organization. General Assembly resolution 1852 (XVII) of 19 December 1962 added two other factors: membership in the United Nations and the population of the Member State.

10. From 1962 until 1988, the importance, or weight, of each factor varied according to successive General Assembly resolutions, but preference was always,

[1] See A/652, paras. 7-9.

and continues to be, given to the contribution factor. Discussions among Member States about the changes in the factors for equitable geographical distribution have been characterized by two main points of view. One group of Member States, composed largely of developing countries, wanted more weight to be given to the membership factor, or alternatively to the population factor, whereas another group, composed mainly of Member States with high rates of assessment, wanted to keep the greater weight on the contribution factor.

11. In its resolution 41/206 C of 11 December 1986, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit updated calculations on desirable ranges for all Member States, taking into account, inter alia, criteria such as (a) the desirability of the base figure for the calculations being related to the actual number of posts subject to geographical distribution; (b) the movement towards the establishment of parity between the membership and contribution factors; (c) the direct allocation of posts subject to the population factor in proportion to each Member State's population; and (d) the need for flexibility upward and downward from the midpoint of the desirable ranges. This resulted in the adoption of resolution 42/220 A of 21 December 1987, introducing as from 1 January 1988 the current regime for the system of desirable ranges.

12. The General Assembly, in its resolution 42/220 A, requested the Secretary-General to base the desirable ranges, with effect from 1 January 1988, on the following criteria:

(a) The base figure for the calculations would initially be 2,700 posts;

(b) The weight of the membership factor would be 40 per cent of the base figure;

(c) The population factor, which would be allotted a weight of 5 per cent, would be directly related to the population of Member States, and posts subject to that factor would be distributed among Member States in proportion to their population;

(d) The contribution factor would be based on the distribution of the remaining posts among Member States in proportion to the scale of assessments;

(e) The upper and lower limits of each range would be based on flexibility of 15 per cent upward and downward from the midpoint of the desirable range, but not less than 4.8 posts up and down, the upper limit of the range being not less than 14 posts;

(f) The base figure would be adjusted whenever the actual number of posts subject to geographical distribution increased or decreased by 100, the weights of the three factors being maintained.

13. Since 1988, the system's basic criteria for the definition of desirable ranges have remained unchanged. The weight of the factors taken into account for the distribution of geographical posts remains at 55 per cent for contribution, 40 per cent for membership and 5 per cent for population.

III. Current status

A. Regular budget posts

14. The base figure used for the calculation of all ranges as at 30 June 2010 based on the number of posts subject to geographical distribution is 3,300.[2]

15. The principle that all Member States ought to be represented in the Organization is reflected in the membership factor, which is applied equally to all Member States. It is equal to 6.88 posts for each Member State, which is the total number of posts for this factor (40 per cent of 3,300 = 1,320 posts), divided by 192, the number of Member States.

16. The differences in population among Member States are taken into account through the population factor. It is based on the proportion of each Member State's population relative to the global population of all Member States. For each country, this factor is equal to the total number of posts for the population factor (5 per cent of 3,300 = 165 posts) divided by the total population of all Member States and multiplied by the population of the relevant Member State.

17. The posts allotted to the contribution factor are distributed to the Member States in proportion to the latest scale of assessments for the contributions of Member States to the regular budget of the Organization. For each Member State this factor equals the total number of posts for the contribution factor (55 per cent of 3,300 = 1,815 posts) divided by 100 and multiplied by the Member State's assessment percentage.

18. The posts allotted to each Member State through the application of the contribution, membership and population factors are added together to establish the midpoint of each Member State's desirable range. The upper and lower limits of each desirable range would be based on flexibility of 15 per cent upward and downward from the midpoint of the desirable range, but not less than 4.8 posts up and down, the upper limit of the range being not less than 14 posts.

19. A Member State is considered "unrepresented" when not a single one of its nationals is serving in a post subject to geographical distribution having gone through the established selection process. It is "underrepresented" when the number of its nationals appointed to such posts is below the lower limit of the desirable range. It is "within range" when the number of its nationals appointed to such posts is between the upper and lower limits of the desirable range; and it is "overrepresented" when the number of its nationals appointed to such posts exceeds the upper limit of the desirable range. The representation status of Member States is affected by many factors, notably turnover of staff, changes in the scale of assessments and changes in the total number of Member States.

20. Administrative instruction ST/AI/2010/3 on the staff selection system specifies geographic status as the status given to staff in the Professional and above categories on initial fixed-term appointment for one year or longer against a position subject to "equitable geographical distribution" and to the application of the system

[2] At 30 June 2010, the actual number of posts subject to geographical distribution was 3,373; in accordance with resolution 42/220 A, sect. III, para. 1 (f), the base figure is rounded down to the nearest hundred.

of desirable ranges, namely, a regular budget post in the Secretariat at the Professional level or above (except language positions up to and including P-5). All successful candidates in a national competitive recruitment examination also receive "geographic status". Once geographic status has been given, it is retained throughout the period of uninterrupted service of the staff member, regardless of the nature of the position or functions to which the staff member may subsequently be assigned.

21. Staff considered to be holding appointments with geographic status are those appointed by the Secretary-General for a period of at least one year to posts funded under the regular budget at the Professional and higher categories under the system of desirable ranges.

22. The following categories of staff are excluded from geographic appointment status:

(a) Staff appointed to the secretariats of subsidiary programmes, funds and organs with special status in matters of appointment;

(b) Staff appointed to peacekeeping posts, posts specifically funded for other field mission service or posts financed under the support account for peacekeeping operations;

(c) Staff appointed to posts with special language requirements;

(d) Staff in the Field Service and the General Service and related categories (such as Trades and Crafts, Security and Safety Service and Public Information Assistants) who are locally recruited;

(e) Staff appointed to posts for service limited to the United Nations Environment Programme;

(f) Staff appointed to posts for service limited to the United Nations Human Settlements Programme;

(g) Staff appointed to posts for service limited to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime;

(h) Staff appointed to posts financed on an inter-agency basis;

(i) Staff appointed to technical cooperation project posts;

(j) National officers at United Nations information centres.

Staff on special leave without pay and on secondment to other organizations are not included in the total number of staff in geographic posts.

IV. Scenarios: changes in geographical status of Member States as a result of using different weightings and base figures

23. Annex I to the present report presents similar scenarios that were reported in the previous report on desirable ranges (A/59/724), which have now been updated for the number of geographical posts and staff as at 30 June 2010, scales of assessment, Member State populations and a new Member State. The scenarios calculate how Member State representation would change when various weightings

of factors (membership, population and contribution) are changed and or base figures are changed.

24. Annex I, table 1, is a comparative summary of potential Member State representation based on the scenarios, and annex I, table 2, presents a comparative analysis for each individual Member State of its potential representation based on the same scenarios.

25. The scenarios consist of three groups, with each group presenting a number of individual scenarios. The scenarios are grouped according to focus on particular changes as follows:

(a) Scenario Group I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure (annex I, table 1, scenarios 1-5);

(b) Scenario Group II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of new funding categories: annex I, table 1, scenarios 6 to 7;

(c) Scenario Group III: weighted ranges: annex I, table 1, scenarios 8 to 13 (see annex II, table, for the methodology).

A. Scenario Group I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure (annex I, table 1, scenarios 1-5)

26. In these scenarios, changes are made to the geographical distribution by varying the weight of the membership, population and contribution factors while maintaining the base figure and staff with geographic status from Member States at the 30 June 2010 levels of 3,300 and 2,886, respectively.

Scenario 1: increase membership weighting, decrease population and contribution weightings

27. In this scenario, weighting is 100 per cent on membership (setting the population and contribution weighting at zero per cent) thus giving each Member State an equal number of posts (17 posts). This results in just over a four-fold increase in the number of underrepresented Member States, from the situation of 31, at 30 June 2010, to 128; and a decrease of 78 per cent of Member States within range, from 132 to 29. The number of overrepresented Member States increases from 17 to 23 and the number of unrepresented Member States remains the same at 12.

Scenario 2: increase population weighting, decrease membership and contribution weightings

28. In this scenario, weighting is 100 per cent on population in determining each Member State's desirable range (setting the membership and contribution weighting at zero per cent). This results in decreases in the number of underrepresented Member States, from 31 to 30, and Member States within range, from 132 to 122. In contrast, the number of overrepresented Member States increases by 65 per cent, from 17 to 28, with the number of unrepresented Member States remaining at 12.

Scenario 3: increase contribution weighting, decrease membership and population weightings

29. In this scenario, weighting is 100 per cent on contribution (setting the membership and population weighting at zero per cent) resulting in a decrease in the number of underrepresented Member States, from 31 to 21, and increases in the number of overrepresented Member States and Member States within range, from 17 to 19 and 132 to 140, respectively. The number of unrepresented Member States remains at 12.

Scenario 4: increase membership and population weightings, decrease contribution weightings

30. In this scenario, membership weighting is increased to 75 per cent and population weighting increases to 10 per cent, while contribution decreases to 15 per cent. This results in nearly a four-fold increase in the number of underrepresented Member States from 31 to 112 and nearly a three-fold decrease in the number of Member States within range from 132 to 46. The number of overrepresented Member States also increases from 17 to 22, with the number of unrepresented Member States remaining at 12.

Scenario 5: increase contribution weighting, decrease membership weighting

31. In this scenario, contribution weighting is increased to 70 per cent, with the membership weighting being reduced to 25 per cent and the population weighting maintained at 5 per cent. This results in a decrease of 45 per cent in the number of underrepresented Member States, from 31 to 17, and an increase of Member States within range, from 132 to 146. Under this scenario, the number of unrepresented and overrepresented Member States does not change, remaining at 12 and 17, respectively.

B. Scenario Group II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of new funding categories (annex I, table 1, scenarios 6-7)

32. In these scenarios, changes are made by increasing the base figure and staff with geographic status from the situation at 30 June 2010 of 3,300 and 2,886, so as to include other staff that do not currently have geographic status. In these scenarios, the weight of the membership, population and contribution factors are maintained at the current levels (40 per cent, 5 per cent and 55 per cent, respectively).

Scenario 6: increase base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget

33. In this scenario, all posts at the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget are included (expanding the population mainly to include language posts) in calculating the Member States desirable ranges. In doing so, the base figure increases to 4,300 posts and staff with geographical status increases to 3,795 staff members. This results in an increase in the number of underrepresented and overrepresented Member States, from 31 to 69 and from 17 to 29, respectively;

and the number of Member States within range decreases from 132 to 82, and the number of unrepresented Member States remains at 12.

Scenario 7: increase base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget and extrabudgetary resources

34. In this scenario, all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget and extrabudgetary[3] resources are included in the base figure so increasing the base figure to 10,300 posts and staff with geographical status increases to 7,893 staff members. Under this scenario, the number of unrepresented Member States decreases from 12 to 7. The number of underrepresented and overrepresented Member States increases from 31 to 118 and 17 to 38, respectively, and number of Member States within range would be reduced from 132 to 29.

C. Scenario Group III: weighted ranges (annex I, table 1, scenarios 8-13)

35. In these scenarios changes are made by the application of a weighted system of ranges (see annex II, table, for the methodology for deriving the weighted ranges). The weighted system of ranges applies different weights to each grade level based on the gross salary per annum payable at that grade. As a result, a senior level staff is apportioned a greater weight than a junior level staff member. Using the weighted base figure, several different scenarios are then calculated by varying the weights of membership, population and contribution as similarly applied in Scenario Group I and by expanding the base figure and staff with geographical status as similarly applied in Scenario Group II.

Scenario 8: weighted base figure

36. In this scenario, the based figure as at 30 June 2010 of 3,300 posts and 2,886 staff with geographical status is used to calculate a weighted base figure for Member States while weightings of membership, population and contribution are not changed. This results in increases in the number of underrepresented and overrepresented Member States, increasing from 31 to 34 and 17 to 30, respectively. The number of Member States within range decreases from 132 to 116; the number of unrepresented Member States remains at 12.

Scenario 9: increase weighted base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget

37. In this scenario all posts at the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget are incl ded in the weighted base figure (similar to scenario 6), while weightings of membership, population and contribution are not changed. This results in two fold increases in the number of underrepresented and overrepresented Member States, increasing from 31 to 70 and 17 to 35, respectively. The number of Member States within range decreases from 132 to 75, while the number of unrepresented Member States remains at 12.

[3] Extrabudgetary includes assessed peacekeeping budgets and trust funds.

Scenario 10: increase weighted base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget and extrabudgetary resources

38. In this scenario, the weighted ranges are calculated with the weighted base figure being expanded to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget and extrabudgetary (similar to scenario 7) and weightings of membership, population and contribution are not changed. This results in a decrease in the number of unrepresented Member States, from 12 to 7. The number of underrepresented and overrepresented Member States increases from 31 to 105 and 17 to 53, respectively, and the number of Member States within range will be reduced from 132 to 27.

Scenario 11: weighted base figure, increase membership weighting, decrease population and contribution weightings

39. In this scenario, the weighted range is calculated similar to scenario 8, while membership is given a weighting of 100 per cent and population and contribution are zero per cent (similar to scenario 1). This results in the number of underrepresented Member States increasing by nearly four-fold, from 31 to 123. While the number of Member States within range decreases from 132 to 30, the number of overrepresented Member States increases from 17 to 27 and the number of unrepresented Member States remains at 12.

Scenario 12: weighted base figure, increase contribution weighting, decrease membership and population weightings

40. In this scenario, the weighted range is calculated similar to scenario 8, while contribution is given a weighting of 100 per cent and the membership and population are zero per cent (similar to scenario 3). This results in a decrease in the number of underrepresented Member States, from 31 to 17, and increases in the number of overrepresented Member States, from 17 to 27, and Member States within range, from 132 to 136. The number of unrepresented Member States remains at 12.

Scenario 13: weighted base figure, increase membership and population weightings, decrease contribution weightings

41. In this scenario, the weighted range is calculated similar to scenario 8, while membership is given a weighting of 75 per cent, population at 10 per cent and contribution factor at 15 per cent (similar to scenario 4). This results in the number of underrepresented and overrepresented Member States increasing from 31 to 107 and from 17 to 28, respectively; the number of Member States within range decreases by nearly three-folds from 132 to 45; and the number of unrepresented Member States does not change from 12.

V. Conclusion and recommendation

42. The present report shows the impact on the system of geographical distribution if changes were to be made to the weights of existing factors (membership, population and contribution) to determine the desirable ranges of representation for Member States, as well as to the base figure of number of posts included in the system of desirable ranges. The various scenarios described in the report show how

changing the weights of the factors will result in changes in the representation status of Member States. The same is true when the base figure is expanded to include staff currently not having geographic status.

43. Notwithstanding any decision of the General Assembly regarding weights given to each factor, the Secretary-General would like to highlight to the General Assembly his continued efforts to address the issues surrounding representation of Member States in the Secretariat. The efforts of the Secretary-General include ensuring that selection decisions take into consideration, among other factors, the nationality of recommended candidates. This includes dedicated outreach services. The Organization has and will continue to engage in targeted outreach campaigns designed to foster an understanding of careers in the Secretariat and to encourage applications from nationals of unrepresented and underrepresented Member States.

44. The Secretary-General recommends that the General Assembly consider the scenarios presented in the present report and give further guidance to the Secretariat, as appropriate.

Annex I

Table 1

Comparative summary of potential Member State representation based on the scenarios as at 30 June 2010

Groups	#	Scenarios	Base figure (No. of posts)	Staff with geographic status	Weightings (percentage)			Member States' representation*			
					Membership	Population[a]	Contribution[a]	Un-	Under	Within range	Over
		Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	**3 300**	**2 886**	**40**	**5**	**55**	**12**	**31**	**132**	**17**
I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure	1	Increase membership weighting, decrease population and contribution weightings	3 300	2 886	100	0	0	12	128	29	23
	2	Increase population weighting, decrease membership and contribution weightings	3 300	2 886	0	100	0	12	30	122	28
	3	Increase contribution weighting, decrease membership and population weightings	3 300	2 886	0	0	100	12	21	140	19
	4	Increase membership and population weightings, decrease contribution weightings	3 300	2 886	75	10	15	12	112	46	22
	5	Increase contribution weighting, decrease membership weighting	3 300	2 886	25	5	70	12	17	146	17
II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of new funding categories	6	Increase base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget	4 300	3 795	40	5	55	12	69	82	29
	7	Increase base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget and extrabudgetary**	10 300	7 893	40	5	55	7	118	29	38

			Base figure (No. of posts)	Staff with geographic status	Weighted base figure	Weightings (percentage) Membership	Population[a]	Contribution[b]	Member States' representation* Un	Under	Within range	Over
	8	Weighted base figure	3 300	2 886	312 307	40	5	55	12	34	116	30
	9	Increase weighted base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget	4 300	3 795	397 757	40	5	55	12	70	75	35
	10	Increase weighted base figure to include all posts in the Professional and higher categories under the regular budget and extrabudgetary**	10 300	7 893	931 584	40	5	55	7	105	27	53
III: weighted ranges (see annex II, table)	11	Weighted base figure, increase membership weighting, decrease population and contribution weightings	3 300	2 886	312 307	100	0	0	12	123	30	27
	12	Weighted base figure, increase contribution weighting, decrease membership and population weightings	3 300	2 886	312 307	0	0	100	12	17	136	27
	13	Weighted base figure, increase membership and population weightings, decrease contribution weightings	3 300	2 886	312 307	75	10	15	12	107	45	28

Note:

* Un = Unrepresented, Under = underrepresented, Within = within range, Over = overrepresented.

** Extrabudgetary includes assessed peacekeeping budgets and trust funds.

[a] See 2010 World Population Estimates, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, 2009 (available from http://esa.un.org/unpp/index.asp?panel=1).

[b] See General Assembly resolution 64/248.

Table 2

Comparative analysis for each individual Member State of their potential representation based on the scenarios as at 30 June 2010

		Scenarios[a]												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					*II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories*		*III: weighted ranges*					
Member State	*Representation situation as at 30 June 2010*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*
Afghanistan	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Albania	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within
Algeria	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under
Andorra	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Angola	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Antigua and Barbuda	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Argentina	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
Armenia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within
Australia	Over	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over
Austria	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Under	Over	Within	Within	Over	Over	Over
Azerbaijan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Bahamas	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within
Bahrain	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Bangladesh	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Barbados	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Belarus	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Belgium	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over
Belize	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Benin	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Bhutan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under

Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	Scenarios[a]												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Botswana	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Brazil	Within	Over	Under	Under	Over	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Over	Within	Over
Brunei Darussalam	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Bulgaria	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
Burkina Faso	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Burundi	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Cambodia	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Cameroon	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over
Canada	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over
Cape Verde	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Central African Republic	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Chad	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Chile	Within	Within	Over	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
China	Within	Over	Under	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Within	Within
Colombia	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Under	Within	Under
Comoros	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Un
Congo	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under
Costa Rica	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Côte d'Ivoire	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Within
Croatia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within
Cuba	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Cyprus	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Czech Republic	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Within
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Un

Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	Scenarios												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Denmark	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within
Djibouti	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Dominica	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Dominican Republic	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Ecuador	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Egypt	Over	Within	Under	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
El Salvador	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within
Equatorial Guinea	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Eritrea	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Estonia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Ethiopia	Over	Within	Under	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
Fiji	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within
Finland	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within
France	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Under	Over
Gabon	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Gambia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Within
Georgia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Germany	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Under	Under	Over	Under	Under	Over	Under	Over
Ghana	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
Greece	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within
Grenada	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Guatemala	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Guinea	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under

Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	Scenarios[a]												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Guinea-Bissau	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Guyana	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
Haiti	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under
Honduras	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Hungary	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Over	Within
Iceland	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
India	Within	Over	Under	Over	Under	Within	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within
Indonesia	Within	Within	Under	Over	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Over	Under
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Iraq	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under
Ireland	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within
Israel	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within
Italy	Over	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Within	Under	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Over
Jamaica	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within
Japan	Under	Over	Over	Under	Over	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Over	Under	Over
Jordan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Within	Within
Kazakhstan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Kenya	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
Kiribati	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un
Kuwait	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Un
Kyrgyzstan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Lao People's Democratic Republic	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Latvia	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Lebanon	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
Lesotho	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under

		Scenarios[a]												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Liberia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Liechtenstein	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un
Lithuania	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Luxembourg	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Madagascar	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Malawi	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under
Malaysia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within
Maldives	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Mali	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Under	Within	Within
Malta	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Marshall Islands	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un
Mauritania	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under
Mauritius	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under
Mexico	Within	Over	Within	Under	Over	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Over	Under	Over
Micronesia (Federated States of)	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Monaco	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Mongolia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Montenegro	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Morocco	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Under	Within	Within
Mozambique	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Myanmar	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Namibia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Nauru	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un
Nepal	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under

Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	Scenarios[a]												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Netherlands	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Within	Under	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Over
New Zealand	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Within
Nicaragua	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Niger	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under
Nigeria	Within	Within	Under	Over	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within
Norway	Under	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within
Oman	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Pakistan	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Under
Palau	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un
Panama	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Papua New Guinea	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Paraguay	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Peru	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Under	Within	Within
Philippines	Over	Over	Under	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
Poland	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within
Portugal	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within	Within
Qatar	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Republic of Korea	Under	Over	Over	Under	Over	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Over	Under	Over
Republic of Moldova	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Romania	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within
Russian Federation	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
Rwanda	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Saint Lucia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under

		Scenarios[a]												
		I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Samoa	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
San Marino	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Sao Tome and Principe	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Un
Saudi Arabia	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under
Senegal	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Within	Within
Serbia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Within
Seychelles	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Sierra Leone	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Over	Under	Under	Over	Under	Within	Under
Singapore	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within
Slovakia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within
Slovenia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Solomon Islands	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Somalia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under
South Africa	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
Spain	Under	Over	Over	Under	Over	Under	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Under	Over
Sri Lanka	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Sudan	Within	Under	Under	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Under	Within	Within
Suriname	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Swaziland	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Sweden	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over
Switzerland	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over	Within	Over	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Over
Syrian Arab Republic	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Under	Within	Under
Tajikistan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under

Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	Scenarios[a] I: varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II: changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III: weighted ranges					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Thailand	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Over	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Timor-Leste	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Under	Un	Un	Un
Togo	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Tonga	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Trinidad and Tobago	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over
Tunisia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Under	Within	Within
Turkey	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under
Turkmenistan	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Tuvalu	Under	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Uganda	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over
Ukraine	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over
United Arab Emirates	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Under	Over	Over	Under	Over	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Under	Over
United Republic of Tanzania	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Within	Over	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Within
United States of America	Under	Over	Over	Under	Over	Under	Under	Under	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Over
Uruguay	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Within
Uzbekistan	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under
Vanuatu	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un	Un

Member State	Representation situation as at 30 June 2010	Scenarios[a] I. varying the weights of existing factors within the current base figure					II. changes the number of posts in the base figure through the inclusion of funding categories		III. weighted ranges					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Within	Within	Within	Over	Within	Over	Within	Under	Over	Over	Within	Within	Over	Within
Viet Nam	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Yemen	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Within	Under	Under	Within	Under	Under	Under	Within	Under
Zambia	Within	Under	Within	Within	Under	Within	Within	Within	Within	Within	Over	Under	Within	Under
Zimbabwe	Over	Within	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Over	Within	Over	Over

[a] Un = Unrepresented, Under = underrepresented, Within = within range, Over = overrepresented.

Annex II

Methodology: Scenario III: weighted ranges (Scenarios # 8 to 13)

1. The overall weighted base figure is derived by taking the percentage of total staff in each grade (see table, second column) and multiplying it by the base figure of 3,300 posts (see table, third column). The resulting figure is weighted by the gross salary per annum in United States dollars divided by 1,000 (see table, fourth column) to produce a weighted base figure (see table, fifth column). The weighted base figures for each grade are added together to get the overall weighted base figure (i.e., 312,307). As at 30 June 2010, the weighted average value of each post was 94.64 points (312,307 divided by 3,300). Accordingly, the weighted membership factor is 124,923 points (40 per cent of 312,307), the weighted population factor is 15,615 points (5 per cent) and the weighted contribution factor is 171,769 points (55 per cent). For each Member State a separate calculation based on the same factors results in a weighted base figure. The weighted midpoint is equal to the sum of the weighted membership, population and contribution factors, and the weighted range is calculated as 15 per cent upwards and downwards (but not less than 454 points up and down — 4.8 times 94.64), with the upper limit being not less than 1,325 points (14 times 94.64). The weighted staff position for each Member State comprises the total number of staff of that country by grade, multiplied by the gross annual salary by grade.

2. Any difference in Member States' representation between the weighted and the non-weighted systems of ranges is determined by the way the staff of any country is distributed over the different grades in the Professional and higher categories. In case of an even distribution of staff of a Member State from the P-2 to the D-2 grade and beyond, the difference between the weighted and the non-weighted systems of ranges is minimal, and an application of the weighted system will not lead to changes in the representation status of that Member State. If the staff is not evenly spread over the grades, changes in the Member State's representation status may occur.

Table
Methodology for deriving weighted ranges

	(1)	*(2)*	*(3)=(2) x base*	*(4)*	*(5)=(3) x (4)*
Grade	*Number of staff*	*Percentage of total*	*Weighted number of staff*	*Salary*[a]	*Weighted base figure*
USG	27	0.94	30.87	201	6 206
ASG	20	0.69	22.87	183	4 185
D-2	71	2.46	81.19	150	12 178
D-1	249	8.63	284.72	137	39 007
P-5	533	18.47	609.46	113	68 869
P-4	828	28.69	946.78	93	88 050
P-3	732	25.36	837.01	76	63 612
P-2	426	14.76	487.11	62	30 201
Total	**2 886**	**100.00**	**3 300.00**		**312 307**

[a] Gross annual salary, in United States dollars, divided by 1,000. Salary scale effective 1 January 2010 (ST/IC/2010/4).